Theodoret’s chief importance is as a dogmatic theologian, it having fallen to his lot to take part in the great monophysite- Nestorian controversy and to be the most considerable opponent of the views of Cyril and Dioscurus of Alexandria. For more than twenty years he maintained the struggle against the Alexandrian dogmatic and its formulæ (*θεοτόκος, έvωσις καθ' ύπόστασιν, μία ύπόστασις, ένωσις φυσική,* and the like), and taught that in the person of Christ we must strictly distinguish two natures (*hypo­stases*)*,* which are united indeed in one person (*prosopon*)*,* but are not amalgamated in essence. For these years his history coincides with that of the Eastern Church from 430 to 451, and for this very reason it is impossible to sketch it even briefly here (see Hefele, *Conc.· gesch.,* vol. ii.). The issue was not unfavourable to Theodoret’s cause, but melancholy enough for Theodoret himself: the council of Chalcedon condemned monophysitism indeed, but he unhappily yielded to pressure so far as also to take part in pronouncing “ anathema upon Nestorius, and upon all who call not the Holy Virgin Mother of God, and who divide the one Son into two.” As Theodoret had previously been a constant defender of Nestorius, it was impossible for him to concur in this sentence upon his unfortu­nate friend with a clear conscience, and in point of fact he did not change his own dogmatic position. It is distressing, therefore, to find him in his subsequent *Epitome* classing Nestorius as a heretic, and speaking of him with the utmost hostility. Some of Theo­doret’s dogmatic works are no longer extant: of his five books ∏εpί έ*νανθρωπήσεως,* for example, directed against Cyril after the council of Ephesus, we now possess fragments merely. A good deal of what passes under his name has been wrongly attributed to him. Certainly genuine are the refutation (*’Ανατροπή)* of Cyril’s twelve *αναθεματισμοί* of Nestorius, and the *Έρανίστης,* or *Πολύμορφος* (written about 446), consisting of three dialogues, entitled respect­ively 'Ατpεπτos, *'Ασύγχυτος,* and *'Απαθής,* in which the monophys- itism of Cyril is opposed, and its Apollinarian character insisted on. Among the apologetico-dogmatic works of Theodoret must be reckoned his ten discourses Περί *προνοίας.*

Theodoret gives a valuable exposition of his own dogmatic in the fifth book of his *Αιρετικής κακομυθίας έπιτομή,* already referred to.@@1 This, the latest of his works in the domain of church his­tory (it was written after 451), is a source of great though not of primary importance for the history of the old heresies. In spite of the investigations of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, we are still some­what in the dark as to the authorities he used. The chief un­certainty is as to whether he knew Justin’s *Syntagma,* and also as to whether he had access to the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus in their complete form. Besides this work Theodoret has also left us a church history in five books, from 324 to 429, which was pub­lished shortly before the council of Chalcedon. The style is better than that of Socrates and Sozomen, as Photius has remarked, but as a contribution to history the work is inferior in importance. It is probable that its author was acquainted with the labours of Socrates ; he appears also to have used those of Philostorgius the Arian, but not those of Sozomen. Something indeed still remains to be cleared up as to the sources he employed ; apart, however, from some documents he has preserved, relating to the Arian con­troversy, he does not contribute much that is not to be met with in Socrates. He made a thorough study of the writings of Athanasius for the work. As regards chronology he is not very trustworthy ; on the other hand, his moderation towards opponents, not except­ing Cyril, deserves recognition. The *'Ελληνικών θεραπευτική παθημάτων {De Curandis Græcorum Affectionibus)—*written before 438—is of an historical and apologetic character, very largely indebted to Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius ; it aims at showing the advantages of Christianity as compared with Hellenism, and deals with the assaults of pagan adversaries. The superiority of the Christian faith both philosophically and ethically is set forth, the chief stress being laid on monachism, with which heathen philosophy has nothing to compare. Much prominence is also given to the cult of saints and martyrs.

On this side of his character, however, Theodoret can best be studied in the thirty ascetic biographies of his *Φιλόθεος ιστορία.* This collection, which has been widely read, is a pendant to the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius and the monkish tales of Sozomen. For the East it has had the same importance as the similar writings of J crome, Sulpicius, Severus, and Cassianus for the West. It shows that the “sobriety” of the Antiochene scholars can be predicated only of their exegesis ; their style of piety was as exaggerated in its devotion to the ideals of monasticism as was that of their mono­physite opponents. Indeed, one of the oldest leaders of the school, Diodorus of Tarsus, was himself among the strictest ascetics.

Nearly 200 letters of Theodoret have come down to us, partly in a separate collection, partly in the *Acta* of the councils, and partly in the Latin of Marius Mercator ; they are of great value not only

for the biography of the writer but also for the history of his diocese and of the church in general.

The edition of Sirmond (Paris, 1642) was afterwards completed by Garnier (1684), who has also written dissertations on the author’s works. Schulze and Nösselt published a new edition (6 vols., Halle, 1769-74) based on that of their predecessors; a glossary was afterwards added by Bauer. The reprint will be found in vols. lxxx.-lxxxiv. of Migne, and considerable portions occur in Mansi.

Besides the earlier labours of Tillemont, Ceillier, Oudin, Du Pin, and Fabricius and Harless, see Schröckh, *Kirchεngesch.,* vol. xviii.; Hefele, *Conc.-gesch.,* vol. ii. ; Richter, *De Theodoreto Epp. Paul. Interprete,* Leipsic, 1822; Binder, *Études sur Theodoret,* Geneva, 1844; Stäudlin, *Gesch. u. Lit. der Kirchengesch.,* Hanover. 1827; Kihn, *Die Bedeutung der antioch. Schule,* 1866; Diestel, *Das A. T. in der christi. Kirche,* Jena, 1869; Specht, *Theodor υ. Mopsvestia u. Theodoret v. Cyrus,* Munich, 1871 ; Roos, *De Theodoreto Clementis et Eusebii Compilatore,* Halle, 1883; Jeep, *Quellenuntersuch. z. d. griech. Kirchenhistorikern,* Leipsic, 1884; and Möller, art. "Theodoret," In Herzog-Plitt’s *Realencykl.,* vol. xv. (A. HA.)

THEODORIC, king of the Ostrogoths (c. 454-526). Referring to the article Goths for a general statement of the position of this, the greatest ruler that the Gothic nation produced, we add here some details of a more personal kind. Theodoric was born about the year 454, and was the son of Theudemir, one of three brothers who reigned over the East Goths, at that time settled in Pannonia. The day of his birth coincided with the arrival of the news of a victory of his uncle Walamir over the sons of Attila. The name of Theodoric’s mother was Erelieva, and she is called the concubine of Theudemir. The Byzantine historians generally call him son of Walamir, apparently because the latter was the best known member of the royal fraternity. At the age of seven he was sent as a hostage to the court of Constan­tinople, and there spent ten years of his life, which doubt­less exercised a most important influence on his after career. Shortly after his return to his father (about 471) he secretly, with a *comitatus* of 10,000 men, attacked the king of the Sarmatians, and wrested from him the import­ant city of Singidunum (Belgrade). In 473 Theudemir, now chief king of the Ostrogoths, invaded Mœsia and Macedonia, and obtained a permanent settlement for his people near Thessalonica. Theodoric took the chief part in this expedition, the result of which was to remove the Ostrogoths from the now barbarous Pannonia, and to settle them as “ fœderati ” in the heart of the empire. About 474 Theudemir died, and for the fourteen following years Theodoric was chiefly engaged in a series of profitless wars, or rather plundering expeditions, partly against the emperor Zeno, but partly against a rival Gothic chieftain, another Theodoric, son of Triarius.@@2 In 488 he set out at the head of his people to win Italy from Odoacer. There is no doubt that he had for this enterprise the sanction of the emperor, only too anxious to be rid of so troublesome a guest. But the precise nature of the rela­tion which was to unite the two powers in the event of Theodoric’s success was, perhaps purposely, left vague. Theodoric’s complete practical independence, combined with a great show of deference for the empire, reminds us somewhat of the relation of the old East India Company to the Mogul dynasty at Delhi, but the Ostrogoth was sometimes actually at war with his imperial friend. The invasion and conquest of Italy occupied more than four years (488-493). Theodoric, who marched round the head of the Venetian Gulf, had to fight a fierce battle with the Gepidæ, probably in the valley of the Save. At the Sontius (Isonzo) he found his passage barred by Odoacer, over whom he gained a complete victory (28th August 489). A yet more decisive victory followed on the 30th September at Verona. Odoacer fled to Ravenna, and it seemed as if the conquest of Italy was complete. It was delayed, however, for three years by the treachery of Tufa, an officer who had deserted from the service of Odoacer, and of Frederic the Rugian, one of the com­panions of Theodoric, as well as by the intervention of the Burgundians on behalf of Odoacer. A sally was made

@@@1 Roman Catholic writers vary greatly in their estimate of Theodoret’s christology and of his general orthodoxy. On the latest essay on this subject, by Bertram ( *Theodoreti, Episcopi Cyrensis, Doctrina Christo- logica,* Hildesheim, 1883), see *Theol. Lit.-Ztung.,* 1883, 563 *sq.*

@@@2 In one of the intervals of friendship with the emperor in 483 Theodoric was made master of the household troops and in 484 consul.